

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Review and reconsideration of the subject application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, and, 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yatsuyanagi et al (JP 08-025117). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Paragraphs 2-3 and 16-18 of the specification describe that the drill automatically feeds slowly into the drilling object, and then feeds faster into the working object so that the drill head does not easily slide sideways when it comes into contact with the drilling object. The feeding velocity of the feeding motor 17 is set to a specified value by turning second control 34. The drill then operates automatically at an initial force to make just enough of a penetration in the drilling object. The operator can turn off the drill and then apply a force from the drill onto the drilling object. When the operator determines that the drill has sufficiently penetrated into the drilling object, the operator sets the drill to automatically drill at a faster velocity but allows for manual influence of the feeding motor's feeding force. This process is distinctly different from starting at a fully manual state of operation using the manual feeding handle and later switching to an automatic boring operation as described in Yatsuyanagi, as

opposed to a drilling operation. Accordingly, the Yatsuyanagi reference is not relevant to the claims as it deals with a boring operation of a precut hole. Thus, the Yatsuyanagi reference does not include a core-drilling device or a core drill, as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is requested.

In addition, Yatsuyanagi does not disclose or suggest "a control unit (30) that is electrically connected to the feeding unit, this feeding unit comprising at least a first control (33) for manual influence of the feeding motor's (17) feeding force," as required by claim 1. The Yatsuyanagi describes a drill assembly that allows the operator to start a drilling cycle with the drill being fully manually-controlled, and then automatically controlled. Yatsuyanagi describes a boring assembly 6 used to machine the sides of a precut hole 32. The specification of Yatsuyanagi states "the manual delivery handle 9 is rotated," which means that the first cut is accomplished with manual feeding as the machine is lowered and correctly located before locking the machine with magnets. The tool of Yatsuyanagi is stabilized by the precut hole 32, so the problem of the drill bit tending to "walk away" or move sideways does not exist. The machine then begins its automatic operation. Nothing in the Yatsuyanagi reference discloses or suggests providing a first control for manually influencing the feeding motor's feeding force, as recited in claim 1. The Yatsuyanagi is either in the automatic mode or is manually moved. In contrast to the boring operation of Yatsuyanagi, when a core drill reaches the surface to be drilled without a precut hole, one side

of the drill usually reaches the surface first which will result in the drill tending to move sideways. Thus, there is also no reason to modify the Yatsuyanagi reference to provide a manual influence over the feeding motor's feeding force due to the precut hole 32 in Yatsuyanagi. Accordingly, Yatsuyanagi does not teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 1. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is requested.

Claims 2-5, 7, and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yatsuyanagi et al (JP 08-025117). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. As set forth above, Yatsuyanagi fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not arrive at the core-drilling device described in claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Applicant is prepared to proceed to an appeal if a Notice of Allowance is not provided. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application. If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ABE1-41411.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP



Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 34512

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: April 29, 2010